

Puget Sound Partnership Ecosystem Coordination Board Meeting Summary

May 6, 2010

Tukwila Community Center, Tukwila, WA

Strait of Juan de Fuca	Steve	Tharinger
Whidbey Basin	Gary	Rowe
Hood Canal	Teri	King
South Central Puget Sound - Designee	Fred	Jarrett for Dow Constantine
North Central Puget Sound	Steve	Bauer
South Puget Sound	Dan	Wrye
Business Interest	Sam	Anderson
Small Business	Bill	Dewey
Environmental Interest – Alternate	Dave	Peeler
Environmental Interest	Mark	Hersh
Cities	Jeanne	Burbidge
Counties	Dave	Somers
Tribal Government	David	Troutt
Tribal Government	Randy	Kinley
Tribal Government	Dave	Herrera
Federal Government - alternate	Elizabeth	Babcock
Federal Government – alternate	Mary	Mahaffy
Washington State Agencies - Designee	Josh	Baldi
Washington State Agencies - Designee	Margen	Carlson
Washington State Agencies - Designee	Naki	Stevens
Northwest Straits Commission	Ginny	Broadhurst

It is intended that this summary be used along with meeting notebook materials and recording be used as the formal record of this meeting.

Action Items:

- Approve March 5, 2010, Meeting Summary
- Approve revisions to Board Charter, Roles, and Guidelines document

Meeting Summary:

- Open meeting
- Board Basics
 - ECB term assignments briefing
 - Revisions to Charter, Roles, and Guidelines
 - Environmental Representative appointment update
- Shorelines Work Group
- 2010 Action Agenda Cost Estimation and State Budget Planning
- EPA FFY2010 update
- 2011 Legislation
- Agency and member updates

10:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER

Ecosystem Coordination Board (ECB) Chair Dave Somers called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m.

Newly appointed South Central Action Area Representative Dow Constantine was unable to attend the meeting at the last minute; Fred Jarrett represented the Executive at this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 18, 2010 MEETING SUMMARY

Mary Mahaffy **MOVED** approval of the March 6, 2010, meeting summary. Dan Wrye **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** the March 6, 2010, meeting summary as presented.

BOARD BASICS

ECB Term Assignment and Revision to Board Charter, Roles, and Guidelines Document

Chair Dave Somers reviewed the ECB terms memorandum included in the packet. (See meeting materials for details.) This memorandum noted the Leadership Council approval of 4-year terms for those ECB members the Council appoints. The Council also decided that appointments made to fill mid-term vacancies finish the term out, not start a new term as was the process outlined in the ECB's charter document. Due to this Council decision, the charter needed the revision approved.

Steve Tharinger **MOVED** approval to the charter change. Dan Wrye **SECONDED**. The Board **APPROVED** revision to the charter document to read: "If a representative resigns prior to fulfilling the term, the new appointment will finish the current four-year term."

ECB Environmental Representative Appointment Status Update

Lynda Ransley reviewed the status of the Environmental Caucus representative appointment. The Leadership Council will make this appointment at its June 17, 2010, meeting. (See meeting materials for details.)

Dave Peeler thought that caucuses should be able to select their own representatives. He reported the Environmental Caucus was developing its own representative selection process.

Kathy Fletcher, who was in the audience for a portion of this meeting, also voiced her concern with the role of the caucuses and asked if they will be able to decide who will represent them in the future?

Bill Ruckelshaus noted that this kind of problem is not unique to this Board. He agreed the Leadership Council would be wrong not listen to what the caucuses recommend but reported it is the Leadership Council's role to appoint and the Council does not want to give up that role. They need to have an open ongoing dialog with all the caucuses and may need to clarify the process

for the future. The solicitation that went to the public didn't mention the role of the Environmental Caucus and that added to the confusion. The Leadership Council will ask staff to better document the process for future appointments.

SHORELINES PROTECTION WORK GROUP

ECB Shorelines Protection Subcommittee chair David Troutt led this discussion. (See meeting materials for details.)

David Troutt provided an overview of the recommendations developed by the ECB Shorelines Protection subcommittee. He reported the ECB Shoreline Protection Subcommittee's purpose is to bring recommendations to the ECB on:

- Definition of "no net loss"
- Development of an integrated comprehensive strategy, and
- Propose actionable means to accomplish

To get our hands around the definition of "no net loss" and to evaluate the "no net loss" for the Shoreline Master Plan (SMP) the subcommittee is recommending using drift cell scale to assess.

David explained there are 812 drift cells around the Sound. They are unique and mapped – they change as we put in hardened structures. He noted that only 7% have no alteration due to human intervention and 20-25% are changed but still functional. The subcommittee is recommending a goal of 65% functioning by 2020 with a long-term vision of 85% functional in 2060. He believes it is better to shoot for a higher number. The subcommittee would like to have the ECB embrace the proposed goal. The subcommittee will then develop the plan on how to get there. We need to start somewhere today and use adaptive management if the goals aren't the correct ones.

The Board discussed the recommendation and the need for aspirational goals. They talked about how not all drift cells are equal so may want to focus on the highest value drift cells, which may make more sense to people. General agreement that the target isn't as important as it is to go in the right direction. We also need to defend decisions.

David Troutt suggested the ECB adopt 65% functioning by 2020 as their goal statement and ask the Leadership Council to approve at its June meeting. The subcommittee would then move forward with plan development. They need some endorsement before continuing.

Dan Wrye discussed how this is the first group under the ECB and he believes is has set a good precedence and have been very successful in taking a large issue and getting it down to a manageable piece.

The Board discussed the process to move forward. General thought would have ECB adopt and present to the Leadership Council as a formal recommendation. The Council would then need to

adopt and include approval of staff to work on the issue and direction to the subcommittee to follow through with the next steps.

It was suggested to have the subcommittee, when developing the final recommendations, do a cross walk with the Action Agenda and pull out the links there, this would make the proposal stronger.

It was also suggested to include a plan for educating the public on what a drift cell is, need to incorporate that now so that people know what drift cells are.

The Board discussed how they have time to work on this before the next session but it will take a lot of work. Generally should be able to agree on supporting encouraging green (soft armoring) and discouraging gray (hard armoring).

Dave Somers heard the Board saying that drift cell is the appropriate level of management but there will be a lot more work to define what is healthy and tools to make it healthy.

David Troutt noted the subcommittee does want to have an aspirational goal – the 65% just gets us moving – he is concerned that if we don't make a goal we won't start moving.

The Board discussed pros and cons with selecting an aspirational goal at this time. We need be able to have people see what they will achieve if they meet the goals and it needs to be something they can really understand. Whatever the goal is, it will be challenged scientifically – needs to be clear, defensible and supported by the public.

Fred Jarrett expressed concern that the group is making a mistake in the way they are talking about the aspirational goals – talking like they are reporting goals. He noted there is a difference.

Dave Somers heard broad support of measurable unity – drift cells have been identified. Also believes the group agrees the subcommittee's concept is solid. He asked the subcommittee to do additional work on goals and targets and how each will be used and bring this back to the ECB for final approval. It was suggested to include Fred Jarrett on the subcommittee to provide his expertise. David Troutt noted he would appreciate Fred's inclusion in this work.

The Board provided consensus on the shoreline proposal and support for the subcommittee to continue work and bring back additional information to the July ECB meeting.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dale Jensen, Department of Ecology, Oil Spill Program, discussed oil spill prevention in Washington State and need for continued investment in training and preventive measures. He reported on the State's involvement in the Louisiana spill and the inventory of equipment that we need to keep on hand. When looking to move our equipment to other places we need to make

sure we keep enough to protect the resources here. If we have a large spill we don't have time on our side and environmental damage would be bad. The Louisiana spill is beyond a worse case scenario. He will continue to ask for ECB support of the Oil Spill program.

Margen Carlson reported that the Department of Fish and Wildlife also has an oil spill response program that works with Ecology and also needs continued support.

Susan Vanklook, citizen, reported that she is on a fact-finding mission for herself and asked for several pieces of information concerning shorelines and drift cells. (*Note: Staff followed up with Ms. Vanklook and provided requested information after the meeting.*)

2010 ACTION AGENDA COST ESTIMATION AND STATE BUDGET PLANNING

Jim Cahill provided an overview of the state agency budget process and how the ECB links into this process. (See meeting materials for details.)

Jim and David will be meeting with state and federal agencies to get answers to: What is reasonable? What, if you got more funding, could you do? And what are key goals to accomplish? The Partnership will also be meeting with the Associations of Counties and Cities to discuss funding gaps and needs. We need to have good rationale for the budget requests especially in light of the current budget concerns.

Jim hasn't met with tribes yet but he plans to and asked to meet with the ECB tribal representatives after this meeting to discuss the best way to make this happen.

The group discussed the budget process and plans to move forward. This is the "stop, go, modify" exercise required in statute. Jim asked if the ECB would like to make recommendations on actions to move forward during the July meeting for Leadership Council approval at its July meeting. The Board would like this brought back to the July ECB meeting to be able to provide input to the Leadership Council.

EPA FFY2010

Tom Eaton was unable to make the meeting today so asked Richard Parkin to present this information. (See meeting materials for details.)

Richard reported that EPA is gathering information for development of a concept paper. Once this paper is developed, EPA will go out for public comments again in July and hope to make final recommendations by early August and release the RFP by September 1. They realize the need to get the money out quickly so will try to shave time off the schedule wherever possible. He noted the appropriation language, although better than past years, still requires coordination with state agencies but this then conflicts with the need to keep separation between grantees and

granters. Because of this condition, EPA needs to get input from all the entities to keep a level playing field and that takes additional time.

ECB member discussion and recommendations included:

- Concern with length of time it will take to get the funds out
- Find ways to better link the funds to the Action Agenda and send the money through the Partnership
- Encourage partnering to limit the number of applications coming in – it is in all our best interest to get this money out
- Frame this to do more partnering on issues such as stormwater and shorelines which are the main issues that this group has discussed
- Include an Action Area focus on some projects
- Allow funding for implementation
- Add on-site septic, salmon recovery, and shoreline banking to the list of eligible projects

Richard reported the approach EPA is thinking about is a wholesale process to get funding to the best entity to distribute them. The lead entity would get the funds through the competitive process and the plan to distribute the funds would be part of the application process.

He also explained how they are trying to get caught up with the funding cycles – they have been behind since 2008 when they only released half the funding while the Action Agenda was being developed.

It was suggested they build on 2009 criteria. Richard's concern was that 2009 criteria was fairly focused and lots of items fell out. EPA believe they need to go broader this round.

Science Panel vice chair Joel Baker attended the meeting to provide comments on behalf of science. He appreciates the difficult position EPA is in and encouraged using the Biennial Science Work Plan (BSWP) again as was used in the 2009 process. He noted some of the activities listed in the BSWP have been started but continued funding is needed. The Partnership is getting ready to release the Puget Sound Science Update (PSSU), which would also provide good information to use in distribution of these funds. He asked how to direct funds to the science account, which is listed in statute. He noted that if funds were in the science account then the Science Panel could use this account to provide grants and require science review and monitoring on the projects.

Richard will take comments back and try to shave time off the process where possible.

LEGISLATION

Executive Director David Dicks provided an overview of the 2010 legislative session. (See meeting materials for details.) This included bills concerning:

- Copper brakes pads – worked with Ecology and business

- Marine Spatial Planning – will zone areas and has a national nexus
- Derelict fishing and shellfish gear – resolved a liability issue

The Stormwater legislation didn't pass this year so we will be looking at other options for next session.

David noted staff will be reviewing the Action Agenda and bring specific recommendations to the ECB for input at the July meeting.

The group asked if there is a state agency process to review legislative packages of the other agencies and make sure they align with the Action Agenda? David reported there is not a formal process but the Partnership is working with the state agencies. Josh Baldi reported he would be willing to bring Ecology's list to the next ECB meeting.

Dave Peeler noted that it is good to have Ecology and the Partnership start work on the stormwater issue early this year. He stressed the importance of having folks stand together on issues especially on budget. That showed this year, even though we didn't get everything we wanted, we did get some funding back up due to our combined efforts. Next year will be another very tough budget year and we need a strong coalition again.

David echoed Dave's comments and expressed thanks to the environmental community for identifying the Natural Resource budget as one of its priorities.

David also provided an update on the Federal legislative side. He reported that we are still working on the legislation that would make the Partnership a line item in the federal budget. This legislation would be very explicit on how to the distribute funds.

Bill Ruckelshaus complimented David on how hard he has been working to get funding, the discussion earlier with EPA didn't reflect that. David deserves credit to how he has worked the funding issues in DC.

The Legislative discussion will continue at the July 15 ECB meeting.

AGENCY AND MEMBER UPDATES

Dan Wrye provided a handout outlining a proposal for an ECB stormwater subcommittee. He requested endorsement of this proposal. (See meeting materials for details.)

Board members were concerned with endorsing the recommendation when this was the first opportunity they had to see the proposal. After discussion the Board agreed to have Dan create a steering committee to bring a proposed charter for an ECB Stormwater Subcommittee to the July meeting for decision. The proposal needs to be provided to members enough in advance of the July meeting to provide opportunity to discuss with the various caucuses.

Sam Anderson reported that at the Association of Washington Businesses (AWB) meeting committee members were very appreciative of the fee in lieu process being done through the Partnership. The advice the AWB wanted Sam to convey to the Partnership was to work with Ecology and identify things that are duplicative in the permitting process and streamline. This would help businesses to be more efficient and would be a very positive thing for the business community.

Dave Somers discussed a conflict between the agricultural community and salmon restoration efforts in Snohomish County. The agricultural group has put forward a “no net loss” of farmland proposal, which is a conflict with the restoration plans. A group has been formed in the County to bring both groups together to find ways to work through the issues.

3:30 p.m. ADJOURN

- The ECB provided blessing to shoreline protection subcommittee’s recommendation – the subcommittee will bring clarification on stretch “aspirational” goals to the July ECB meeting
- Jim Cahill will provide draft state budget language to Board prior to the July meeting
- David Dicks/Michael Grayum will bring recommended legislative priorities to next meeting
- Dan Wrye will report back on ECB stormwater subcommittee development recommendation

Ecosystem Coordination Board Approval



Dave Somers, Chair

Date

Next Meeting: July 15, 2010
 WSU Research Facility
 Mt. Vernon, Washington